Document 97 Filed 10/21/05

Page 1 of 3

Case 3:05-cr-00465-JSW

This matter came on the calendar of the Honorable James Larson on October 7, 2005 following the defendant's initial appearance in this district on October 3, 2005. At the parties' request, the Court continued the matter until November 17, 2005, which was the date previously set before Judge White for the co-defendants (with the exception of defendant Kuo, who has not yet appeared in this district). The parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act on two bases.

First, the parties requested an exclusion of time based upon the need for effective preparation of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv). Defense counsel Juliana Drous is new to this case and will need ample time to review the voluminous discovery. While most of the discovery has been turned over, there is some outstanding discovery remaining. Much of that discovery needs to be translated into English, which may take up to one month.

Second, defendant Kuo has not yet made an appearance in this district. She was ordered removed from the Central District of California and is en route in the custody of the United States Marshals. Time is excludable as delay resulting from the removal of a defendant from one district to another. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(G).

Therefore, the parties are requesting an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act. The parties agree that the time from October 7 through November 17, 2005 should be excluded in computing the time within which trial must commence. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(1)(G), 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time from October 7 through November 17, 2005 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

The Court finds that the delay resulting from the removal of defendant Kuo from the Central District of California to this district is excludable. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(G).

The Court finds that the failure to grant the requested exclusion would deny the defendant reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

The Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested exclusion

outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt 1 disposition of criminal cases. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). The Court therefore concludes 2 3 that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) 4 SO ORDERED. 5 IT IS SO ORDERED DATED: 6 October 21, 2005 **HONOR** Judge Nandor J. Vadas 7 TE JUDGE Nandor 8 U.S. Magistrate Judge 9 Approved as to form: 10 /s/ Juliana Drous JULIANA DROUS 11 12 Counsel for Defendant PETERS 13 /s/ Monica Fernandez MONICA FERNANDEZ 14 Assistant United States Attorney Counsel for the United States 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

[PROPOSED] ORD. EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE STA AS TO DEFT. PETERS No.: CR 05-00465-JSW